

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



**ASSOCIATION of
GOVERNMENTS**

Main Office

818 West Seventh Street
12th Floor
Los Angeles, California
90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800

f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

Officers: President: Gary Ovitt, San Bernardino County • First Vice President: Richard Dixon, Lake Forest • Second Vice President: Harry Baldwin, San Gabriel • Immediate Past President: Yvonne B. Burke, Los Angeles County

Imperial County: Victor Carrillo, Imperial County • Jon Edney, El Centro

Los Angeles County: Yvonne B. Burke, Los Angeles County • Zev Yaroslavsky, Los Angeles County • Richard Alarcon, Los Angeles • Jim Aidingier, Manhattan Beach • Harry Baldwin, San Gabriel • Todd Campbell, Burbank • Tony Cardenas, Los Angeles • Stan Carroll, La Habra Heights • Margaret Clark, Rosemead • Gene Daniels, Paramount • Judy Dunlap, Inglewood • Rae Gabelich, Long Beach • David Gafin, Downey • Eric Garcetti, Los Angeles • Wendy Greuel, Los Angeles • Frank Gurule, Cudahy • Jim Jeffra, Lancaster • Janice Hahn, Los Angeles • Isadore Hall, Compton • Keith W. Hanks, Azusa • José Huizar, Los Angeles • Tom LaBonge, Los Angeles • Paula Lantz, Pomona • Barbara Messina, Alhambra • Paul Nowatka, Torrance • Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica • Bernard Parks, Los Angeles • Jan Perry, Los Angeles • Ed Reyes, Los Angeles • Bill Rosendahl, Los Angeles • Greg Smith, Los Angeles • Tom Sykes, Walnut • Mike Ten, South Pasadena • Tonia Reyes Uranga, Long Beach • Antonio Villaraigosa, Los Angeles • Dennis Washburn, Calabasas • Jack Weiss, Los Angeles • Herb J. Wesson, Jr., Los Angeles • Dennis Zine, Los Angeles

Orange County: Chris Norby, Orange County • Christine Barnes, La Palma • John Beauman, Brea • Lou Bone, Tustin • Debbie Cook, Huntington Beach • Leslie Daigle, Newport Beach • Richard Dixon, Lake Forest • Troy Edgar, Los Alamitos • Paul Glaab, Laguna Niguel • Robert Hernandez, Anaheim • Sharon Quirk, Fullerton

Riverside County: Jeff Stone, Riverside County • Thomas Buckley, Lake Elsinore • Bonnie Flickinger, Moreno Valley • Ron Loveridge, Riverside • Greg Pettis, Cathedral City • Ron Roberts, Temecula

San Bernardino County: Gary Ovitt, San Bernardino County • Lawrence Dale, Barstow • Paul Eaton, Montclair • Lee Ann Garcia, Grand Terrace • Tim Jasper, Town of Apple Valley • Larry McCaillon, Highland • Deborah Robertson, Rialto • Alan Wagner, Ontario

Ventura County: Linda Parks, Ventura County • Glen Becerra, Simi Valley • Carl Morehouse, San Buenaventura • Toni Young, Port Hueneme

Orange County Transportation Authority: Art Brown, Buena Park

**Riverside County Transportation
Commission:** Robin Lowe, Hemet

**Ventura County Transportation
Commission:** Keith Millhouse, Moorpark

MEETING OF THE

OPEN SPACE WORKING GROUP

Tuesday, July 10, 2007

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

SCAG Offices

**818 West 7th Street, 12th Floor
Conference Room – Riverside A
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213.236.1800**

Teleconferencing Available

***Please RSVP with Christine Fernandez
24 hours in advance.***

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Christine Fernandez at 213.236.1923 or fernande@scag.ca.gov.

Agendas and Minutes for the Open Space Working Group are also available at: <http://www.scag.ca.gov/rcp/openspace.htm>

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. If you require such assistance, please contact SCAG at (213) 236-1868 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to enable SCAG to make reasonable arrangements. To request documents related to this document in an alternative format, please contact (213) 236-1868.

Open Space Working Group

AGENDA

PAGE #

TIME

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

**Liz Chattin,
Chair**

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Members of the public desiring to speak on an agenda item or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the group, must fill out and present a speaker's card to the assistant prior to speaking. A speaker's card must be turned in before the meeting is called to order. Comments will be limited to three minutes. The chair may limit the total time for all comments to twenty (20) minutes.

3.0 REVIEW and PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

4.1 Approval Item

4.1.1 Minutes of May 8, 2007
Attachment

01

5.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

**5.1 New Ruralism Framework
Attachment**

Sibella Kraus will present a framework for preserving and enhancing urban agricultural areas (videoconference).

**Sibella
Kraus,
Sage Center**

03

45 minutes

**5.2 Ventura County Wildlife Movement and
CEQA Guidance Projects
Attachment**

Liz Chattin will provide an overview of Ventura County's wildlife movement design and mitigation guidance.

**Liz
Chattin,
Chair**

07

45 minutes

**5.3 RCP Vision and Guiding Principles
Attachment**

Staff will present the vision and guiding principles developed for the RCP.

**Jennifer
Sarnecki,
SCAG Staff**

08

20 minutes

Open Space Working Group

AGENDA

PAGE #

TIME

6.0 CHAIR'S REPORT

7.0 STAFF REPORT

Staff will report on upcoming schedule and future topics.

8.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Any Committee members or staff desiring to place items on a future agenda may make such request. Comments should be limited to three (3) minutes.

9.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

10.0 ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the Open Space Working is scheduled for Tuesday September 11, 2007 at the SCAG offices.

Open Space Work Group
of the
Southern California Association of Governments

May 8, 2007

Minutes

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE OPEN SPACE WORKING GROUP. AN AUDIOCASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S LOS ANGELES OFFICE.

The Open Space Working Group held its meeting at the SCAG Offices, Downtown Los Angeles.

Members Present:

Liz Chattin, Chair	County of Ventura
Glen Dake	LA Community Garden Council
Ashwani Yasishth	Cal State University Northridge
Frank Simpson	RMC
Changmii Bou	Los Angeles County Parks & Recreation
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Robert Sun	UCLA
Jade Lockhart	Amigos de los Rios
Jim South	Los Angeles County Parks & Recreation
Tony Young	SGRMC

SCAG Staff:

Jacob Lieb	
Jessica Kirchner	
Jill Egerman	
Christine Fernandez	
Jean Carr	Jones and Stokes

1.0 CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLIGANCE

The meeting was called to order at 10:12 a.m.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

No public comments were received.

3.0 REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

4.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

4.1 Approval Item

4.1.1 Minutes of March 13, 2007

Motion was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved.

5.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

5.1 Update on Agricultural Lands Workshop

Jean Carr, Jones and Stokes, provided the group with a presentation on the revised draft/recommendation of the regional program and SCAG's role.

The following items were reported:

- The Action Plan is focused on regionally significant open space resources
- The Action plan includes 10 actions, progressing from minor changes to existing SCAG policies/programs to implementation of entirely new programs. Ms. Carr discussed each action.
- Conservation Opportunity Areas are based on criteria rather than map.
- Sub-regional workshops will be scheduled with a proposed schedule to be issues later this week.

Ms. Carr also provided Working Group members with a draft of the Open Space Program. Members reviewed the draft and provided feedback.

6.0 CHAIR'S REPORT

There were no items to report.

7.0 STAFF REPORT

There were no items to report.

8.0 FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

There were no future agenda items to report.

9.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

10.0 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:12 pm. The next meeting of the Open Space Work Group will be held at SCAG's Los Angeles office on July 10, 2007.

A CALL FOR NEW RURALISM

by Sibella Kraus



New Ruralism is a framework for creating a bridge between Sustainable Agriculture and New Urbanism. Sustainable agriculture can help bring cities down to earth, to a deeper commitment to the ecology and economy of the surrounding countryside on which they depend. New Ruralism embraces the power of place-making that can help American agriculture move from an artificially narrow production focus to encompass broader resource preservation values. As a place-based and systems-based framework, the New Ruralism nurtures the symbiotic relationship between urban and rural areas. To build this bridge, and with support from the Columbia Foundation, the Institute of Urban & Regional Development (IURD) and Sustainable Agriculture Education (SAGE) are jointly launching a project on New Ruralism.

Here are some ideas about what this could mean.

THE RATIONALE FOR NEW RURALISM

To thrive and endure, regions and the cities within them need a vital local agricultural system that encompasses individual farms, rural communities, and stewardship of natural resources. As it stands, rural areas - especially those at the urban edge - face enormous challenges. In California, as in many parts of the developed world, agricultural operations near cities are under extreme pressure from suburbanization, environmental degradation, and an industrialized and globalized farm economy. Urban areas are contending with the flip side of this problem: the multiple costs of sprawl and a national crisis of diet-, exercise-, and built environment-related health problems. Too many urban residents are increasingly overfed and undernourished. They are disconnected from rural and natural surroundings that further recede with increasing low-den-

sity auto-dependent urbanization. In many ways, industrialized agriculture and urban sprawl are similar blights, both operating with little regard to the natural conditions of the landscape and oblivious to the ecological and cultural uniqueness of place.

New Ruralism is built on twenty years of reform - in food, agriculture, and land use planning. The sustainable agriculture and local food systems movements have taken organic foods mainstream, made farmers' markets a basic town-center amenity, and put "slow food" on a fast track. At the same time, New Urbanism projects and Smart Growth initiatives have demonstrated the possibilities of creating healthier, more livable urban centers.

Communities large and small are utilizing smart growth tools to create mixed use, pedestrian-friendly and transit-oriented developments; to encourage infill, revitalize downtowns, institute 'green' building policies, and better balance the growth of jobs and housing. New Urbanism acknowledges farmland and nature to be as "important to the metropolis as the garden is the house". Yet approaches for strengthening the vitality of surrounding rural areas as a means to contain and sustain cities have not been thoroughly investigated. In many ways, New Ruralism is now where New Urbanism and Smart Growth were two decades ago - powerful ideas that were being generated mostly by professionals, out of sight of public and academic views.

VISION

Just as New Urbanists and 'critical regionalists' have articulated and demonstrated the potential for a renewed movement of place-affirming urban planning, our regional rural areas need a similar call to action. We are positing New Ruralism as a corollary of

New Urbanism with a related framework of principles, policies, and practices, and with the following as its preliminary vision statement:

New Ruralism is the preservation and enhancement of urban edge rural areas as places that are indispensable to the economic, environmental, and cultural vitality of cities and metropolitan regions.

New Ruralism draws from past models. Some obvious examples are the agrarian context for the 'Garden City' and the self-sufficiency elements of eco-villages. New Ruralism also incorporates current initiatives, such as sustainable city charters, local food policy councils, the agricultural land trust movement, and mechanisms to preserve and enhance regional agriculture and its natural resource base. Most importantly, New Ruralism can harness marketplace forces such as demand for rural lifestyle, countryside view, and food with 'terroir' (a taste of place).

The geography for New Ruralism can be generally defined as rural lands within urban influence; the larger the metropolis, the larger the field of influence. The geographical structure of metropolitan regions extends out from the urban-rural interface and the rural-urban fringe to exurbia and beyond, to urban-influenced farmland. It is too often a contested landscape of transitional land uses, speculative land values, regulatory uncertainty, and impermanent agriculture. The current default attitude in this area is that metropolitan agriculture inevitably dissolves and retreats as the urban footprint expands.

Within this field of urban influence, the New Ruralism movement would help create permanent agricultural preserves as sources of fresh food for the larger urban region, and as places for nurturing urban connections with the land. These could take the form of green



food belt perimeters, buffers between urban areas, small agricultural parks at the urban-rural interface, or bigger preserves further a-field that include larger farms and rural settlements. This vision must work hand in hand with the New Urbanism vision of compact mixed-use urbanized areas, the elimination of low-density auto-dependent sprawl, and distinct "edges" between towns and their surrounding rural working lands.

PRINCIPLES

These ideas for a vision and geography for New Ruralism provide a starting point for some preliminary principles.

New Ruralism would denote specific, named rural places located near an urban area and part of a broader metropolitan region. Such New Ruralist places would have an identity rooted in their unique and significant agricultural, ecological, geographical, and cultural attributes. This identity would contribute to a broader regional sense of place, through local farm products, rural activities, iconic landscape, and opportunities for public experience. These rural places may also have general designations as agricultural preserves or 'appellations' or 'local food belts'.

The primary land use would be small to medium scale sustainable agriculture integrated and overlapping with areas for wildlife and habitat management and for passive recreation.

Conducive agronomic conditions and agricultural history would be primary factors determining the location of such agricultural preserves. Other factors would include dedicated current farmers and identified aspiring farmers; crops and livestock distinctive to the place; processing and marketing infrastructure; affordable housing on farms or in nearby communities for farm employees; and regulations supportive of value-added enterprises and agritourism operations. The 'Wild Farm' movement demonstrates the potential value of this kind of multi-functional agriculture.

Urban-rural connectivity would be a multi-faceted exchange. A major linkage would be in the form of 'locally grown food', promoted through direct marketing channels and through institutional networks. 'Local food-shed' is an attribute ripe for quantification and even certification, due to its value-added connotation of fresh, healthy and flavorful food and its potential for public access and interaction. (Such a place-

based designation has long been used for wines and is now being used for crops tied to place and method of production.) Connectivity would also take the form of physical links to urban green spaces and to regional hiking, equestrian, and biking trail systems. Another linkage is the arena of environmental services. Services such as green waste composting, aquifer recharge, flood and fire protection, and preservation of biodiversity would be part of the urban-rural economic exchange and would help re-establish the value of the ecological structures that underlie the jurisdictional patchwork.

New Ruralist agricultural preserves would welcome the public as both visitors and residents. One of the highest values of rural areas near cities is their attraction as homesites for people who are not farmers. With careful planning, this bane can be a boon. Affirmative agriculture easements and projects such as Vineyard Estates in Livermore and the Qroe¹ model in New England demonstrate the potential for successful symbiosis of estate homes with agriculture, as valued landscape. However, the benefits of country life should not be limited to the wealthy.

Images are courtesy of Karen Preuss, Larry Jacobs, Kate Kline May, Greenbelt Alliance, and SAGE.



Following both the demand for 'rural lifestyle' and the trend for the 'not-so-big-house', clustered, modest non-farm rural home homesites have the potential to be a key value proposition for preserving agricultural land, especially if they are strictly limited and their value is tied in to the local agricultural economy. Perhaps these homeowners can purchase a "share" of the farm production along with their modest dwellings.

The development and management of each agricultural preserve would be guided by a comprehensive plan. Such a plan could be established and implemented as a joint powers agreement between city and county agencies where necessary. Broader regulations and incentives would likely also come into play. The key to establishing rural places reflecting metropolitan regional values is a holistic approach that integrates a wide range of goals for public health, conservation, economic development, housing, agricultural productivity, and more. Within a template framework, each plan might also have specific quantified objectives, such as goals for local food production or local jobs or educational programs. Through these plans, New Ruralist places would cap-

ture and compensate landowners for specific "public good" amenities provided for the local town or broader metropolitan region.

In summary, these ideas for a New Ruralism vision and principles are exploratory, intended to provoke discussion and response. Key questions are:

How can the concept of New Ruralism be most useful for advancing the common goals of sustainable agriculture/local food systems movement and the new urbanism/smart growth movement?

Does New Ruralism provide a meaningful framework for analyzing past models and present initiatives for harmonizing city and countryside? What are the key elements required for it to succeed and what long term benefits would accrue from these successes?

Can New Ruralism be applied as a construct in actual planning projects and be advanced into governmental regulations?

Can a New Ruralist vision, illuminat-

ed by key models, help galvanize the public support and private investment necessary to create urban edge agricultural preserves?

During the coming months, through workshops and white papers, IURD and SAGE plan to continue to explore these and other questions. We welcome your thoughts on our preliminary ideas.

1. The Oro Company develops and manages real estate properties that integrate conservation, farming and housing.

The New Ruralism project is supported by a grant from the Columbia Foundation.

Sibella Kraus is the Project Director, Institute of Urban & Regional Development New Ruralism Initiative and the President of Sustainable Agriculture Education.

MEMO

DATE: July 10, 2007

TO: Open Space Working Group

FROM: Christine Fernandez, Assistant Regional Planner, (213) 236-1923, fernande@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Ventura County Wildlife Movement and CEQA Guidance Projects

Background:

Liz Chattin will provide an overview of the Ventura County Planning Division's Fragmentation, Roads and Biodiversity Project. A spatial representation of the current status of Ventura County's wildlife movement will be shown. Liz Chattin will also provide a general review of the project design and mitigation guidelines that is being submitted to Ventura County's environmental review committee for adoption. These guidelines will become CEQA guidance for Initial Studies and Environmental Impact Reports.

MEMO

DATE: July 10, 2007

TO: Open Space Working Group

FROM: Jennifer Brost Sarnecki, AICP, (213) 236-1829, sarnecki@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Regional Comprehensive Plan Vision and Guiding Principles

BACKGROUND:

The Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) Task Force requested that staff articulate a vision and guiding principles for the RCP. The vision and guiding principles have been reviewed by the RCP Task Force and staff has incorporated the comments in the most recent version.

These statements are an articulation of themes and concepts discussed throughout the RCP process. They are based on the Growth Vision principles of sustainability, livability, prosperity and mobility. They describe how the RCP can promote and sustain these principles and provide a conceptual framework for the document. This approach is consistent with previous RCP Task Force discussions that identified the RCP as part of the Compass Growth Vision and 2% Strategy Implementation. These principles will be addressed in each of the nine chapters.

The Draft Regional Comprehensive Plan is scheduled for release by fall 2007 with the final version accompanying the Regional Transportation Plan's adoption.

REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DRAFT VISION AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Vision

The vision of the Regional Comprehensive Plan is to foster a Southern California region that addresses future needs while recognizing the interrelationship between economic prosperity, natural resource sustainability, and quality of life.

Through measured performance and tangible outcomes, the RCP serves as both an action plan for implementation of short-term strategies and a call to action for strategic, long-term initiatives that are guided by the following Guiding Principles for sustaining a livable region:

Guiding Principles

Principle 1 - Improve mobility for all residents

Improve the efficiency of the transportation system by strategically adding new travel choices to enhance system connectivity in concert with land use decisions and environmental objectives.

Principle 2- Foster livability in all communities

Foster safe, healthy, walkable communities with diverse services, strong civic participation, affordable housing and equal distribution of environmental benefits.

Principle 3 – Enable prosperity for all people

Promote economic vitality and new economies by providing housing, education, and job training opportunities for all people.

Principle 4 – Promote sustainability for future generations

Promote a region where quality of life and economic prosperity for future generations are supported by the sustainable use of natural resources.